



## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Linda Williams (Chair), Dawn Hill-Holdgate (Vice-chair), John McLaughlin, David Barham, Diane Coombs  
**Associate Commissioners:** Jascin Leonardo-Finger, Abigail Camp **Staff:** Mark Voigt, James Grieder

### ~~ MINUTES ~~

#### Tuesday, October 29, 2013 – ORGANIZATIONAL

Public Safety Facility, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Training Room –5:00 p.m.

Called to order at 5:08 p.m.

Staff in attendance: M. Voigt, HDC Administrator; Andrew Vorce, Director PLUS; Leslie Snell, Deputy Director PLUS; T. Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Attending Members: Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Absent Members: Coombs

Late Arrivals: Hill-Holdgate 5:10 p.m.

Early Departures: McLaughlin 8:51 p.m.

Public: Steven Cohen, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP; Kevin Kuester; Chris Skehel, The Castle Group; Richard & Valerie Norton, Norton Preservation Trust; Steve Cheney, Cheney Brothers Building; Matt MacEachern, Emeritus Development; Steve Roethke, S.M. Roethke Design; Joe Joe Topham; Lisa Botticelli, Botticelli & Pohl

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent

#### I. PUBLIC COMMENTS – ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC MAY ADDRESS COMMISSIONERS AT THIS TIME

None

#### III. HDC BUSINESS

##### A. AREAS OF CONCERN

1. Schedule changes for the rest of the year.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (5:10) Meeting for November 26, Tuesday before Thanksgiving, discussion about who will or will not be able to attend: Williams will be absent, Barham will be present, Hill-Holdgate will be present, Leonardo-Finger will be absent, McLaughlin will be present. Discussion about whether or not cancel with only four commissioners known to be able to attend.

Action **Motion to Approve the schedule as printed. (Hill-Holdgate)**

Vote Carried unanimously

2. Request for Legal Services (RLS) update.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (5:14) **Williams** – Town Counsel has asked 86 Main Street and 8 Milestone Road to be placed on agenda for discussion on November 5. Gull Island is being held pending a possible solution.  
**Barham** – Asked that 11 Baxter Road also be on the November 5 agenda. Had a phone call from the owner of 86 Main Street; she wants to talk about the situation. Told her to speak with staff or have her attorney speak to staff.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

3. Fee schedule revisions.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – Reviewed credentials. Clients have stated that the building and development community support raising the fees if it results in a higher level of quality service and professionalism from support staff; stated quality and professional services from staff do not presently exist. Agrees that Boston seems to have the best model, which is simple.  
**Kevin Kuester** – Suggested the cost of an appeal and legal assistance should be factored into the fees.  
**Chris Skehel**, The Castle Group – Pointed out that people pay the Building Department fees with no qualms and the charging 45 cents per square foot is not unreasonable.  
**Steve Roethke**, S.M. Roethke Design – Echoed what Mr. Cohen said. Suggested HDC look at an equitable change; stated he does not believe doubling the fees will make them exorbitant.  
Concerns (5:17) **Williams** – Handed out a copy of some fee suggestions.  
**Vorce** – Asked if what was passed out was what Mr. Voigt submitted.  
**Williams** – Yes, that was unacceptable.  
**Vorce** – The decision rests with the HDC after a public hearing.  
Discussion about 3 proposals received.  
**Staff** – Reviewed the directive from Mr. Vorce and his notes that shows how fees would look if they were brought up to match 100% of costs.  
Discussion about upon what the Building department fees are based.  
**Hill-Holdgate** – Seems HDC should not charge for a like-kind but should charge for a renewal. Expressed concern that if fees get too high for little projects, people will just not come in with applications for permits.  
**Barham** – It seems it is an unfair burden on the taxpayer is bearing the cost of processing HDC applications. Mr. Voigt's doubling of the fee schedule was based upon in the past HDC was taking in fees that were equal to half its operating budget. Referred to the Boston HDC fee schedule as a good template as not putting a burden on the homeowner of modicum income.  
**Williams** – Expressed concern that simply doubling the fees would be considered arbitrary.  
**Camp** – The doubling of fees seems to make some fees high.  
**Leonardo-Finger** – Agree with Mr. Barham.  
**McLaughlin** – Thinks fees should remain where they are. Doubling fees hurts the "little guy."  
**Williams** – Thinks it arbitrary to simply double the fees. Would like to see the "end game."  
**Vorce** – The three year average for incoming revenue for HDC, FY2011, 2012, and 2013, were \$112,047. For FY2015 the direct salaries for Mr. Voigt and Mr. Grieder will be \$193,250; that does not include operations.  
**Barham** – Asked for an estimate for operating HDC that includes some portion of time and supplies from the PLUS. Would like to compare that to the proposed revenue.  
Discussion about HDC operational costs versus revenue.  
**Barham** – Mr. Kuester made an excellent point about carrying a number that reflects cost of legal services and building a reserve to tap into in the event of an appeal.  
**Vorce** – Legal services comes out of the Town Administration budget. PLUS does not carry a line item in its budget for that. Stated that HDC does not need to worry about the coming up with funds to pay for legal services.  
Discussion about how to adjust fees to match operations and still be easy to calculate.  
Action **To have numbers sometime in January to allow for a public hearing about February.**  
Vote N/A

4. Legislative changes to the Act/Review of 40C/Town Code.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – The Act could use a lot of housekeeping. The 40C offers good ideas that could be cribbed from. Changes require both Town Meeting and a formal petition to pass legislature.  
Concerns (5:54) **Williams** – Stated that she met with Mr. Cohen and reviewed the Acts line by line and made editing changes to match 40C and fixed technical stuff; also added 2 addenda to the Act. One addendum is to take the appeal process away from the BOS and put it in the hands of an independent arbiter; from there it would go to the Supreme Court. Would like it put in for Annual Town Meeting. Have not had time to go through the Town Code. Reviewed issues with the Town Code and compared it to other communities.  
**Vorce** – Pointed out that a proposal for this up-coming Annual Town Meeting would need to be complete by January by the time the warrant closes.  
**Barham** – Stated the belief that the HDC needs to go through this step by step with Town Counsel. A schedule needs to be posted detailing when versions need to be done and when HDC will meet with HDC.  
Discussion about the schedule.  
Action **Motion to Approve an RLS to discuss changes to the Act, and Town Code and incorporate 40C. (Barham)**  
Vote Carried unanimously

5. Informational pamphlet.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – Stated it was his idea. Believes it would alleviate a lot of the mystery behind the HDC process.  
Concerns (6:10) **Williams** – Believes in informational pamphlet would help the public to understand HDC's requirements.  
Action **Tabled**  
Vote N/A

6. Article 63 compliance on establishing a workgroup.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – This was adopted at Town Meeting, and recognizes there are concerns and issues with the HDC. According to article 6e, the Town and public are to review those concerns and provide a report at the next Town Meeting (Spring 2014). A workgroup would be a step toward accomplishing this.  
Concerns (6:13) **Snell** – The meetings of the workgroup would have to be posted.  
**Williams** – Expressed concern that workgroup meetings would be an additional HDC obligation and would be cumbersome for commissioners.  
**Vorce** – He could generate ideas for possible members of the workgroup. Said he and Mr. Voigt would discuss it.  
**Williams** – Told anyone interested to send their names to Mr. Voigt.  
Action **Held for a proposal; to be on November 5 agenda.**  
Vote N/A

7. Enforcement process/update every month/what are public and Commissioner complaints and concerns report to the staff, result, response, at least bring to Commission attention. Response time and protocol.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (6:21) **Barham** – Stated he does not see any enforcement happening. Violations seem to be getting more and more flagrant.  
**Vorce** – Have finalized the letter that the administrator will send to violators. Have gone through union negotiations to expand the duties of the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) to include HDC enforcement. TC through minimal maintenance efforts on enforcement.  
**Snell** – The ZEO's duties have also been expanded to include HDC inspections.  
**Williams** – Voiced doubt about the ZEO's qualifications at accomplishing his normal duties much less these new duties.  
**Vorce** – Stated that the conversation was bordering on being inappropriate. The ZEO's duty has been expanded and stated the belief that he can help Mr. Voigt accomplish things.  
**Williams** – Stated the many years ago the commission requested a monthly report on violations and how they were resolved. That happened for a while then stopped. HDC requested it again several months ago and it still is not forthcoming.  
**Vorce** – Stated he will discuss that with Mr. Voigt. However, wants assurance that the commission will use the report.  
**McLaughlin** – Stated that he does not believe that staff's time should be wasted on additional paperwork.  
**Barham** – Suggested that the status report could be made available to the commissioners on line.  
**McLaughlin** – Every single piece of paper coming in to HDC should be stamped.  
Action **Motion to Ask the PLUS Department to institute a tracking mechanism to receive and follow complaints of non-compliance; it is to include the date the complaint was filed, what is being done about it and when it is closed out and to be made available on line. (Barham)**  
Vote Carried 5-1/McLaughlin opposed.

8. Need for third alternate or wait for election.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (6:38) **Williams** – The Act states that alternates are appointed at Town Meeting. In the past, the BOS has appointed the alternate, which isn't legal. Ms Coombs alternate position will be put on the Spring ballot.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

9. New areas of concern such as creation of Old Historic Districts (OHD) for Wauwinet, Old Madaket, Brant Point, Expand SOHD to cover Baxter Road etc., more of Cliff Road, Lincoln Circle, Monomoy, etc.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – Suggested that would be most helpful if there were areas of high and low intensity so HDC spends more time on the historic homes.

**Valerie Norton**, Norton Preservation Trust – There are houses all over the island surrounded by new houses; those need to be properly identified.

Steven Cohen, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP - Addressed the issue of in-fill houses versus new neighborhoods and the level of review in each case.

**Matt MacEachern**, Emeritus Development – Creating secondary zones could be over complicated. Feels the system works now.

**Richard Norton**, Norton Preservation Trust – Originally asked to formulate an idea of what Madaket architecture is; that fell by the wayside. If the advisory boards went forward with that, it would be something from which to work.

**Chris Skehel**, The Castle Group – Expressed his pleasure at the work HDC does in regards to maintaining historical areas.

Concerns (6:40) **Williams** – The number of historical buildings has expanded since the HDC was formed 50 years ago. The Act allows HDC to create new OHDs. Wants commissioners to think about expanding the OHDs.

**Camp** – Likes the idea of hearing from residents in various parts of the island about what they think their neighborhoods should look like.

**Barham** – Could take action that requests staff to forward Baxter Road applications to the ‘Sconset Advisory Board. Likes historic structures in outlying areas that get input from the group that reviews historic structures in the core area. Could ask for historic structures go to Historic Structure Advisory Board.

Discussion about whether or not new advisory boards are necessary or if these areas can be picked up by the existing boards and the possibility of setting up a meeting with the advisory boards. Extended discussion about the philosophy behind the advisory boards.

**Williams** – Stated she is working with Mr. Roethke to do put together an architectural guide for ‘Sconset. Need to focus on each area to establish their unique architectural elements.

Action N/A

Vote N/A

10. Advisory committees, minimum number that need to present to make a recommendation, membership status.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public **Richard Norton**, Norton Preservation Trust – Asked if the conflict of interest pertains to members of the advisory board.

Concerns (7:00) **Barham** – There are people on these boards who have not shown up in years; suggested the seats on the advisory boards be broken up into 3-year appointments.

**McLaughlin** – Stated he believes the positions should be reviewed every year.

**Williams** – The board members should be contacted and verified as members.

**Vorce** – Stated that he would put Mr. Norton’s question to Town Counsel.

**Barham** – Believes it would improve the quality of the advice if a member of that board were at the new business meeting to present their suggestions.

Discussion about only accepting advice when a quorum was not present.

Action **Motion that Ms Williams contact all the names on the list of advisory board members to verify their membership. (Barham)**

Vote Carried unanimously

Break 7:08 to 7:17 p.m.

11. Revisions to demo-by neglect in Town Code section. May not be sustainable as written.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (7:17) See Action Item A.4.

Action N/A

Vote N/A

12. Demo delay extension.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (7:17) **Williams** – Nantucket HDC is the only commission that uses “demo-by neglect.” Need to look into that more. The ruling would delay the demolition of a structure.

Discussion about what Demo delay actually is and if it would be applicable on Nantucket.

Action N/A

Vote N/A

13. Refining 50-year contributing issue, findings of contributing to architectural history, significance.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public **Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – The quality of the structure is important. Houses in Tristram's Landing do have some architectural significance.

Concerns (7:20) **Williams** – 50-years should not be a justification for not allowing work on a house; believes a structure should be contributing in some way.

**Barham** – The survey was held up because the Department of the Interior wanted more attention paid to the Boat Basin, even if they are not yet 50-years old. It's not about the age; it is about the contribution a structure makes to the community.

**McLaughlin** – In his opinion, there are only two historic factors that need to be considered: anything prior to 1947 might have historic significant, nothing since then is all copies.

**Leonardo-Finger** – Stated the Ranch-style homes do have a unique contribution to the history of Nantucket. We are scrubbing clean the little outbuildings that which makes Nantucket what it is. All 1800 houses had out buildings, not water scapes.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

14. Policy on submission of warrant articles.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (7:30) **Williams** – Stated that two articles were submitted by staff without the commission knowing about it. Wants to set a policy that no articles come from staff without commission sign off.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

15. Synthetic materials/alternative energy workshop/presentation.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (7:32) **Williams** – There are synthetic construction materials that are being accepted by other HDCs.

**Leonardo-Finger** – HDC needs to keep in mind that given the nature of the environment here, things happen much differently to materials than anywhere else.

**Barham** – It isn't relevant until someone comes in. Do not think a convention on island about this stuff is feasible.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

16. Update from PLUS administration.

Sitting	Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp
Public	<b>Steven Cohen</b> , Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – Expressed his opinion of what functions the professional staff should be performing to help facilitate the meeting. Does not understand why the professional staff doesn't do that. The board should not be looking at the plans cold at the meeting; they should get pre-packets. Contends that at the last organizational meeting, when Mr. Voigt was asked if he could create a pre-packet, Mr. Voigt said, "No." <b>Lisa Botticelli</b> , Botticelli & Pohl – Brought up the old staff reports. <b>Steve Roethke</b> , S.M. Roethke Design – Stated that he found the "super-sized" agenda for the October 22 meeting to be very helpful. That level of review at the staff level culled out a lot of work done at the meeting.
Concerns	(7:35) <b>Barham</b> – Asked about the new staff being added at HDC and where their time would be centered. <b>Vorce</b> – Explained about vacancies being filled. There is no new professional staff member. There is a trend back toward prior levels. HDC revenue is up over last year. Put in a request to the Community Preservation Committee to update <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind</i> . <b>Barham</b> – With the request that plans be reviewed, it is important to have people on staff who have the skill-set can do that. Too many applications are held at meetings for more information or are struggled with because the application is not complete. Hopes that with the increase in fees, PLUS will be able to hire someone with a preservation background and can read plans. <b>Hill-Holdgate</b> – Seems that staff time could be reorganized to ensure plans are more carefully reviewed. Expressed frustration at the time wasted by the commission with applications that are not complete or could have gone on the consent list. <b>Vorce</b> – Reviewed the increase in the number of applications. <b>Williams</b> – Thinks items that require simple adjustments should go onto consent. Stated that if she can go through all the files in one day, staff should be able to as well. <b>Snell</b> – Hears the request for more professional staff support. There have been issues that pulled one of those people away from his higher functions. Expressed the hope that will no longer be the issue with the two new staff members. <b>Williams</b> – Thinks it is time to hold another staff training session. <b>Barham</b> – Thinks these two new hires should sit in on at least two hours of a meeting to get an understanding of what the commission needs. <b>Williams</b> – Would like to see staff reports again and would like to get a packet of all applications to be reviewed before the meeting. Discussion about the ways to improve the process and save time at the meeting. <b>Barham</b> – Reviewed how the Charleston HDC operates and its efficiency. <b>Voigt</b> – Stated he does not recalling answering "No" to Mr. Cohen and asked for the evidence of that response. In respect to Mr. Barham's comments about Charleston HDC, would like to know what their volume of applications. Pointed out that according to an MHC study in 2000, Nantucket HDC was 10 times busier than next busiest commission in the state. The present volume of applications is comparable to the volume of applications processed in 2000. <b>Williams</b> – Stated that if clerical staff picks up 50% of the "folderol" that Messer's Voigt and Grieder were doing, there is no reason they can't more closely review applications for consent items, completeness, and create pre-packets without adding more staff. <b>Hill-Holdgate</b> – She would prefer to see times pulled off for consent and viewings before the creation of a pre-packet; feels pre-packets puts the load back on the commissioners. <b>Snell</b> – Reviewed priorities for the agenda pulled from this discussion: 1) call out items that were reviewed in advance, 2) have a better consent agenda with description of what is being voted on, 3) calling out any changes that could easily be made that can be put on the consent agenda with conditions, and 4) a summary of major projects coming in. <b>Barham</b> – Continues to have concerns HDC is understaffed in the face of a 30% increase in applications over last year with two people who have some professional training. Pointed out that the commission is asking for a lot of new "stuff" plus inspections and enforcement; that takes time. Other HDCs have three to four times the staff with less volume; this one is still not up to base line. <b>Williams</b> – Stated that is part of the job and if they can't do the job, HDC has a big problem. Expressed the belief that the existing staff should be able to accomplish all that is being asked. Pointed out that it took her 5 hours to review the applications to extract and comment on the consent for the agenda from October 22. <b>Voigt</b> – Suggested fewer meetings in a month would allow for staff to spend more time reviewing the plans. Pointed out that no other town regulator board has the number of meetings as HDC and that can cause open meeting law violations.
Action	N/A
Vote	N/A

**B. APPLICATION ISSUES**

1. Redo of applications: major renovations/new structures; minor changes; move-off/demolition; hardscaping and pools; signs; like-kind repairs; determinations of non-applicability/lack of visibility/constructive approval. Specific information and form for like-kind repairs, staff determination so it is clear no mistakes are made.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns Not addressed at this time.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

2. No incomplete applications should come before the HDC/how to ensure this does not happen/staff review of files.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (8:12) **Williams** – No incomplete applications should come to the table EVER.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

3. Application submission requirements changes/photos/size/details/previous approvals/pictures of existing, depending on scope of work.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns Not addressed at this time.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

4. Not requiring floor plans for minor alterations/revisions.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns Not addressed at this time.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

### C. STAFFING ISSUES

#### 1. Update on-line data base for staff access

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (8:15) **Williams** – Have heard complaints about the lack of a data base; has not been done in about three years.  
**Vorce** – That is being reinstated with the new staff.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

#### 2. Inspection protocol, iPad use; how far should inspection be behind?

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public **Chris Skehel**, The Castle Group – Stated that Mr. Voigt has frequently brought to his attention items that were not appropriate. Pointed out that it is an impossibility to catch everything.

**Steve Roethke**, S.M. Roethke Design – One idea is to put it back on the applicant to close out the process; he takes photos; there could be a requirement that could be met, suggesting 8 photos one of each angle can go to the file. Tried it recently, took photos, submitted them to Mr. Voigt, and called Mr. Roethke on an issue.

**Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP - Feels that requiring the photos exceeds HDC authority; does not think photos of aspects of the structure that are not visible cannot be required.

Concerns (8:18) **Williams** – Believes the inspector should have the iPad with plans at the time of the inspection; expressed that the present method with using photographs is not adequate. This is totally unacceptable.

**Barham & Hill-Holdgate** – Agree.

**Snell** – In February, an inspection protocol was created. Suggested Ms Williams ask Mr. Voigt how inspections are done.

**Williams** – Stated that Mr. Voigt said that he did not compare the photo to the plans, just put the photo in the file.

**Vorce** – Stated that Mr. Voigt has a protocol and Mr. Voigt should explain it.

**Snell** – Reiterated that the commission should hear from Mr. Voigt. Asked for specifics.

**Williams** – You are not getting it; contends that site inspections are not being done. The plan has to go to the site.

**Barham** – Asked if Mr. Vorce and Mr. Voigt reviewed the time needed to complete inspections. Wants to understand the administrative oversight of Mr. Voigt's inspections.

**Vorce** – The HDC has been doing that level of inspections for years. Wished to hear from Mr. Voigt about the process. Stated the opinion that the process is good.

**Voigt** – Would like to go on the record that the plans are looked at. (interrupted) Explained the problem with taking the plans to the site. Reviewed his process of digital photos and the data base that exists for them. Currently he takes the digital camera; looks at property visually and takes photos. Pointed out that according to Town Counsel, he can't enter the property; as a result, there are some properties he can't access. The photos are good quality and show architectural details and those are compared to the actual plans.

**Williams** – Reiterated that in the spring when she asked if the photos were compared to the plans, the answer was no. Finds the "excuse" about windy as weak for not taking a set of plans to the site. Stated she does not have the assurance that HDC is getting the level of inspection that plumbing, wiring and houses get.

**Barham** – Really likes Mr. Roethke's suggestion of the clients providing photos.

**Voigt** – Stated that option has been available to applicants for years. However he needs to be able to save the photos to his database.

**Williams** – Mr. Vorce and Ms Snell can help establish that policy.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

#### 3. Staffing training.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

#### 4. Staff reports.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**



5. Check-list for staff to indicate if a file has been reviewed by the staff and what the status was: complete/not complete.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns Not addressed at this time.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

6. Speeding up the meetings with more pre-meeting review of files by staff.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns See Item A16.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

7. Social media update.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (8:40) **Snell** – Stated that HDC staff met with IT to set up an account to keep people apprised of what is happening at HDC meetings.  
**Voigt** – Mr. Grieder is presently posting the meeting progress on his Facebook page; however, people have to be his “friend.” That is why they are looking at this avenue.  
**Snell** – There are concerns about the page being consistently updated.  
**Voigt** – All those concerns were talked about. It is a matter of when and how the process moves forward.  
**Williams** – Would like that to be further explored.  
**Vorce** – They are looking into it.  
Action **Board consensus is that it would be a good idea to keep applicants informed of the progress of a meeting and any changes in the meeting through social media.**  
Vote N/A

8. Staff time limits for returning phone calls, emails, answering phone, access by public, general public responsiveness.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (8:49) **Williams** – Has received complaints about not getting call backs from staff. Call backs within a reasonable time would help improve HDC image. This is a recurring theme that has been going on for many years that calls are not returned.  
**Vorce** – It is helpful to talk in specifics that can be investigated. It might be that they left the wrong number.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

#### **D. PROCESS ISSUES**

1. HDC website, user friendly, more information such as area plans.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns Not addressed at this time.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

2. How to keep track of 60-day requirements for each application/document each attempt at contacting applicants for extension in writing, new form, better relay of information about 60-day requirement.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns (8:50) **Williams** – Still don’t have a plan for tracking the 60-day deadlines on a spread sheet.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

3. Reduce time commitment for Commission members.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, McLaughlin, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp  
Public None  
Concerns See Item A16.  
Action **N/A**  
Vote N/A

4. Deadlines, issues with making deadline if Tuesday meeting with next deadline, prolonging process of Thursday meetings and deadline passed so delayed over two weeks.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public **Steve Roethke**, S.M. Roethke Design – If the volume is culled, it should allow the change to happen.

**Steven Cohen**, Reade, Gullicksen, Hanley, Gifford & Cohen LLP – Should get rid of the old-business/new-business thing. Suggested considering that signing up on the agenda by noon Wednesday but the plans are not required until noon on Friday.

Concerns (8:51) **Williams** – The deadline of 24-hours after a new-business meeting is not fair. Revisions can't be made in 12 hours over night and in by noon the next day. The deadline used to be Friday by noon.

**Vorce** – It is not possible to do everything this commission is asking with a deadline on Friday; maybe institute a Thursday deadline for revisions. Stated the commission has to be realistic about this.

**Voigt** – Stated that the commission has to meet within 10 days of a deadline. The agenda deadline is 2 p.m. Friday; this now happens every week with two meetings a week. Pointed out that the abutter notification needs to be discussed; that was one reason the new-business deadline was set as it had been. Has received complaints from abutters that they did not receive notification until after the project was heard.

**Williams** – Accused Mr. Voigt of not considering the applicant in this discussion.

Discussion about why Mr. Cohen's suggestion won't work and the idea of mixing both old and new business.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

5. Review packets/views prior to the first new-business hearing on an application, sent like view packets to save time at first meeting of large/new/important projects.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

6. Consent notes so we know what we are approving and not do it blind to avoid mistakes. We do not know what we are voting for. Can do brief staff report on separate sheet.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

7. More thorough consent review of files PRIOR to the meeting in order to enable more to be put on consent, with notes for minor revisions, if necessary.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

8. Automatic views set a head of time, bring files if person wants to talk about it.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns See Item A16.

Action **N/A**

Vote **N/A**

9. OHD/SOHD first on agenda issues.

Sitting Williams, Hill-Holdgate, Barham, Leonardo-Finger, Camp

Public None

Concerns (9:02) **Williams** – Believes that OHDs being first on the agenda is not fair. Wants a vote to go back to first-come-first serve on the agenda.

**Hill-Holdgate** – Old business should be first on the agenda.

**Barham** – Spoke in favor of the present system of historic districts being first on the agenda.

Action **Motion to structure agendas as first-come-first-served with the same highlighting effective immediately. (Hill-Holdgate)**

Vote Carried unanimously

**IV. OTHER HDC BUSINESS \* Not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance.**

Other Business	N/A
Commission Comments	N/A

Action to Adjourn: 9:06 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton